

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above identified patent application is hereby respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1, 6, 7, and 8 have been canceled and claims 2, 9, and 18 have been amended. Claims 2-5 and 9-18 remain in the case.

The applicant appreciates the thoroughness of the review by Examiner Sue A. Weaver and the indication of allowable subject matter.

1. The drawings filed on June 27, 2003 were objected to. Enclosed, find two replacement drawing sheets for replacement Figures 3 and 11. Replacement Figure 3 corrects the inadvertent double use of "16" by adding the required "0" at the end, thereby also now properly showing element "160".

Replacement Figure 11 shows element "506". A copy of FIG. 4 (as filed on June 27<sup>th</sup>) is enclosed where missing elements 204, 206, 208, and 210 appear to be shown.

Replacement page 22 of the specification corrects the typographical error and antecedent basis (second line from top of page) where the first piping was incorrectly identified as element "11". It is now correctly referred to as element "110". Therefore, there is no missing element "11".

Accordingly, all drawing objections are believed to be overcome and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

2-6. The rejections are noted. Please see item 7.

7. Claim 8 was objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, claims 6, 7, and 8 have been canceled and the limitations included in base claim 2. Claim 1 has also been canceled. Accordingly, instant claim 2, pursuant to the Examiner's indication, is now believed to be in condition of allowance and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 was amended only to correct an error in antecedent basis that arose as a result of the above-mentioned claim amendments.

Remaining dependent claims 3-5 and 9-17 include the limitations of instant claim 2 and are therefore also believed to be in condition of allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 has been amended to include the exact same additional limitations as instant claim 2, which is believed to be in condition of allowance. Accordingly, instant base claim 18 is similarly believed to be in condition of allowance and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure has been reviewed by the undersigned, but is deemed no more relevant than the applied references.

9. A suggested format for a certificate of mailing is noted. It is not clear if the Examiner is being exceptionally helpful or if there was believed to be a defect in the applicant's use of the certificate of mail

procedure. If there is a possible defect, further clarification is requested.

As all remaining claims 2-5 and 9-19 appear to be in condition of allowance, reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested, and a notice of allowance is courteously urged at the earliest time.

10. The applicant appreciates the opportunity to communicate by telephone with the Examiner if necessary. It is noted that no Supervisor contact has been provided, however, this information is not believed to be required. Please continue to direct all correspondence to the correspondence address and telephone as shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

 12-10-04

Risto A. Rinne, Jr.  
Reg. # 37,055

2173 East Francisco Blvd.  
Suite E  
San Rafael, CA 94901

1-415-457-6933